

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite an organic electronic light-emitting device. This amendment is supported by the application such as at p. 10, lines 24-31.

§ 112 Rejections

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards (or Applicants regard) as the invention.

The amendments to claims 1 and 23 are believed to obviate these rejections.

§ 102/103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-5, 11-13 and 18-24 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Koike et al. (US 6345903). Claims 2, 6-10, 14-17 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koike et al. as applied above to claim 1.

The amendment of claim 1 is believed to overcome these rejections.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

January 26, 2006
Date

By: /Carolyn A. Fischer/
Carolyn A. Fischer, Reg. No.: 39,091
Telephone No.: 651-575-3915

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833